



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

PN

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/256,346	02/24/1999	KEN-ICHI TAKATORI	Q053397	9700
7590	08/24/2005		EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS			NELSON, ALECIA DIANE	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE N W			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 200377060			2675	

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/256,346	TAKATORI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Alecia D. Nelson	2675	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9 and 16-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 16-19 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. ***Claims 1-9*** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no disclosure found by the examiner in the specification as originally filed which discloses an active matrix liquid crystal display apparatus without intrinsic memory effect comprising simultaneously resetting a voltage difference between pixel electrodes and common electrodes.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2675

4. **Claims 1-4, 8/1, 8/2/1, 8/3/2/1, and 8/4/3/2/1** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mihara (JP Patent No. 405303076) in view of Okada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,800,382) and Hashimoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,295,043).

With reference to **claim 1**, Mihara teaches a method for driving a liquid crystal display device comprising scanning successively a plurality of scan lines in a first field of a frame for display and scanning successively the scan lines in a second field of the frame for display in an order reverse to that in the first field (see page 4, paragraphs 27-28, of computer translation). It can be seen in figure 4 that the first field (left half) scans lines S1-Sn successively and in the second field (right half) scans in a reverse direction from lines Sn-S1.

Mihara fails to specifically teach that the liquid crystal display is of active matrix type, and simultaneously resetting the scan lines in the first field after the scan lines are successively scanned in the first and second field.

Okada teaches a method for driving a liquid crystal display device whereby the states written in the preceding field, or frame, are erased into "white" state (see column 6, lines 24-30). With further reference to an alternate embodiment it is taught that the erasure step (C1) is simultaneously applied to the scanning lines (see column 5, lines 59-63),

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow the erasure step, as taught by Okada, in a driving method similar to that which is taught by Mihara, in order to reduce flickers in the display device.

Further, it would have been obvious to include the simultaneous reset of Okada to the display of Mihara to reduce the amount of scan time required. For example, if the reset period is T1 in Mihara, the total time is  $T1 \times$  Number of scan lines. By providing simultaneous reset as taught by Okada the amount of time to display a frame (frame with two sub-frame) is reduced by  $2 \times [(T1 \times \text{No. of scan lines}) - T1]$ , which is a significant reduction in time to display an image frame.

Further, as to simultaneously resetting the scan lines after the scan lines are displayed, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to simply move the reset period from the start of the sub-frame as shown in fig. 6 of Okada to the end of the sub-frame (for example move the reset period C1 to the end of the display period C2). This would have been obvious when Okada is combined with Mihara as shown in fig. 4 of Mihara because the scan lines are rescanned in the reverse direction and would therefore need to be reset before the display system scans from the bottom row to the top row (i.e., in fig. 4 of Mihara, after row Sn is scanned, the simultaneous reset would occur for all scan lines so the pixels are ready for information to be written during the second sub-frame, i.e., from Sn to S1 (reverse order)).

Also Hashimoto et al. teaches a display device and a driving method, wherein it is disclosed that the driving method could be preformed on a simple matrix type display device as well as an active matrix type display device (see column 9, lines 20-32).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow the wiring of a display device as a simple matrix or active matrix type similar to that which is taught by Hashimoto et al., with the driving method

taught by Mihara and Okada in order to thereby provide faster control over the display device.

With reference to **claim 2**, Mihara teaches that the scanning direction is reversed for every field in interlaced scanning (see page 5, paragraph 33-page 6, paragraph 34, of computer translation).. It can be seen in Figure 6, that the first field (first section) scans lines S1-Sn successively and in the second field (second section) scans in a reverse direction from lines Sn-S1.

With reference to **claim 3**, Mihara specifically teaches that two write periods are provided for each scan line, wherein there are two writes for each scan line since there is a write in the first field when scanned from top to bottom, and a write in the second field when scanned from bottom to top for each scan line contained in a single frame.

As to **claim 4**, it is clear from the modification discussed above with respect to **claim 1**, wherein the simultaneous reset set at the end of each field or sub-frame would result in each scan line being reset twice. For example, Mihara in Fig. 4 shows a first field or sub-frame being scanned from top S1 to bottom Sn which would be followed by a simultaneous reset as described above. The simultaneous reset allows for the scan lines to be written to once more. The second field or second sub-frame is ready to be written to and is scanned from bottom Sn to top S1 and is again followed by a simultaneous reset to allow for the next frame to be scanned. Therefore, the

modification of made to Mihara by Okada would provide two reset periods (**claim 4**) as well as two write periods (**claim 3**) for each scan line.

With reference to **claim 8/1, 8/2, 8/3/2/1, 8/4/3/2/1**, Mihara teaches that the driving method is applicable to drive liquid crystal and it would be obvious to include an apparatus for carrying out the driving of the liquid crystal.

5. **Claims 7 and 9/7/1** are rejected under 35 U.S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mihara in view of Okada and Hashimoto et al. as applied to **claim 1** above, further in view of Surguy (U.S. Patent No. 5,233,338).

With reference to **claim 7**, Mihara and Okada teach all that is required as explained above with reference to claim 1, however fail to teach that the display device successively displays data corresponding to three colors.

Surguy teaches a color sequential liquid crystal display wherein pixel elements are addressed to produce red, green and blue outputs in a display period (see column 4, lines 20-26).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the color outputs, as taught by Surguy, in a device similar to that, which is taught by Mihara and Okada in order to provide less flickers in a full color display device.

With reference to **claim 9/7/1**, Mihara teaches that the driving method is applicable to a drive liquid crystal display device (see abstract).

**Allowable Subject Matter**

6. ***Claims 5, 6, 8/5/3/2/1, and 9/6/5/3/2/1*** are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
7. ***Claims 16-19*** are allowed.

**Response to Arguments**

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

**Conclusion**

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alecia D. Nelson whose telephone number is (703) 305-0143. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Saras can be reached on (703) 305-9720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2675

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

adn/ADN  
August 20, 2005

  
SUMATI LEFKOWITZ  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER